

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilcox; rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 013(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Wengrovitz; and claims 12, 13, 18, and 19 35 U.S.C. § 013(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Roach. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims. Applicant notes that the Examiner has not explicitly indicated the basis for the rejection of claims 2-5, 8-11, and 14-17. Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

Applicant respectfully submits that Wilcock neither teaches nor suggests all the features of the independent claims. As such, Wilcock cannot for the basis of a Section 102 or 103 rejection for any of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites that the "monitoring unit is adapted to provide inquiry data for said first communications device." In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner states:

a monitoring unit (refer to fig. 3 "LC 20" and see "The leg controller 20 . . . monitor the connection state of the entity" recited [0073] lines 8-12] in communication with said first communication device (fig. 3 depicting "LC 20" in "CMS 14" communicating with "LC 20" in "endpoint system 1"), wherein said monitoring unit is adapted to provide inquiry data to said first communication device and is adapted to receive status data from said first communication device (refer to fig. 3 and see the two-way communication between "LC 20" in "CMS 14" and "LC 20 in "endpoint system 1" each sending "(connection state)" data to the other, for which see also "The state of connectivity of the endpoint system is also reported via the use of leg messages" recited [0074] lines 12-14)

(Office Action, August 2, 2007, p. 3.) Applicant has reviewed the relied-upon portions of Wilcock and can find nothing that corresponds to "inquiry data" that is provided to a first communications device as recited by claim 1. The relied-upon portions of Wilcock

describe sending connection state indicating the state of connectivity, but describe nothing about "inquiry data."

Independent claims 8 and 14 recite that the "physical representation represents said communication's device's physical attributes." In rejecting claims 8 and 14, the Examiner states:

a physical representation (see "connection details include the address and type of the session transport" recited [0070] lines 4-5), ... *wherein said physical representation represents said communication device 's physical attributes* ("address and type of the session transport" above)


(Office Action, August 2, 2007, p. 6.) An "address and type of the session transport" are, however, not physical attributes of a device. In particular, the address (e.g., telephone number) and type of session transport are not an attribute that a user would interact with and control. (Specification, 14:26-28.) Applicant can find nothing in the relied-upon portions to suggest the modeling of any physical attributes of a device as recited by these claims.

Based upon the above remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268867US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Maurice J. Pirio
Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant